

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended appropriately.

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Doughty in view of Choe. The Examiner cites Doughty as disclosing the features of the claimed invention, except for the exchange between the application programs by means of a connection program. However, the Examiner comments that Choe discloses this feature. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Choe discloses an interface operation between a private exchange and an ISDN layer, which appear to be interpreted as the application programs of the instant invention. The Examiner also states that an exchange main module interface 21 exchanges signaling information with the central processing module CPM through the common memory (see, paragraph 9, page 4 of the Office Action). The exchange main module interface 21 of Choe (Fig. 3) corresponds to the module “signaling program 100 and Message interface 120” in the instant invention (also Fig. 3), which are commonly used to provide a “switch” and to permit a possible interfacing between two applications even if they have a different protocol (e.g. private exchange/ISDN). Hence, Choe’s solution is well-adapted to realize such an interface between two application programs (signaling/calling) with predefined protocols. However, if the second application program (i.e. calling side) has to cooperate with various protocols of the application program on the signaling side, Choe provides no solution (i.e. this is not disclosed by Choe). Rather, Choe provides an interface solution for interfacing between two specific protocols of applications. In the claimed invention, on the other hand, a connection program 110 allows for this functionality. For example, claims 1 and 2 require that an exchange between the first and second application programs occurs by means of a connection program, such that one of the application programs cooperates with the other application program to provide various protocols of one or both of the application programs.

Additionally, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to modify Doughty with Choe. However, the Examiner may not make conclusory statements of

obviousness without evidentiary support on the record. The Examiner simply states that it would have been obvious to combine the references, but fails to cite a reference in support of this statement. The Examiner is requested to cite a reference in support of his/her reasons for motivation to combine the references, or withdraw the rejection.


Since the recited structure and method are not disclosed by the applied prior art, either alone or in combination, claims 1-11 are patentable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.449122002000. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 48,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762